

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs Emery F. Word  
Carruth J. Wagner Lyman C. Burgess

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin Eric C. Johnson  
Erwin C. Drescher Earl L. White  
Paul T. Erickson Joseph S. Spoto  
John B. Hozler

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney  
Robert H. Felix

The following-named sanitary engineers to be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield  
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.

The following-named surgeon to be temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Raymond A. Vonderlehr

The following-named passed assistant surgeon to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Calvin B. Spencer, October 8, 1943.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State.

##### COAST GUARD

COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE COAST GUARD WHILE SERVING AS DISTRICT COAST GUARD OFFICERS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943, FOR THE NAVAL DISTRICT INDICATED AFTER EACH NAME

Wilfred N. Derby, First Naval District.  
Gordon T. Finlay, Fifth Naval District.  
Joseph F. Farley, Eighth Naval District.  
Philip F. Roach, Twelfth Naval District.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### MICHIGAN

Ernest R. Brodeur, Cadillac.  
Harry Kramer, Holland.  
Frank W. Weinau, Ida.  
George J. Carlton, Mackinaw City.  
Bruce S. Trace, Royal Oak.

##### TENNESSEE

Sadie P. Omohundro, Donelson.  
Thomas D. Walker, Kerrville.  
Henry G. Simpson, Middleton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who takest thought of the humblest life which falls to the ground, we pray Thee to humble our lives before Thy infinite mercy. Thou knowest the vows we have registered and as the divinest conquest is of one's self, enable us to qualify to see visions and share spiritual victory in our own souls. O lift the curtain of the higher world and reveal Thyself to be

glorious and holy as Thy voice bids us go forward to the things which survive the wrecks of iniquitous war.

Vouchsafe, blessed Lord, to make these moments free from weakness and uncertainty; make us an inspiration to every patriotic movement. In the presence of our country's crisis may we frown upon that which darkens, upon every murmur of false criticism, upon every gesture of unjust dissent. Direct all citizens to turn and see the groaning and the travailing, the misery and the captivity endured by our own dear soldier boys—all to make our homes happy and free. Give our land a release from the confusion of tongues and to all eager, restless, doubting ones, let come the challenge of the ages, that in the restoration of this beaten world, America is in the hands of a good God to save the exiles and share its lofty mission with all who mourn. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint Resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 146]

Andrews	Capozzoli	Fay
Baldwin, Md.	Carter	Feighan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Fenton
Barden	Chapman	Fernandez
Barry	Clark	Fish
Beall	Cooley	Fitzpatrick
Bell	Creal	Flannagan
Bender	Crosser	Ford
Bland	Cullen	Gale
Bloom	Curley	Gallagher
Bolton	Davis	Gamble
Bradley, Mich.	Dawson	Gavagan
Buckley	Delaney	Gerlach
Buffett	Dickstein	Gifford
Burch, Va.	Ditter	Gillette
Burchill, N. Y.	Domengeaux	Goodwin
Butler	Douglas	Graham
Byrne	Eberharter	Granger
Canfield	Ellis	Grant, Ala.
Cannon, Fla.	Ellison, Md.	Gregory

Gwynne	Kilburn	Randolph
Hall	Kleberg	Rizley
Leonard W.	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Hare	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Harness, Ind.	Lane	Satterfield
Hart	LeFevre	Scanlon
Hartley	Lesinski	Scott
Hébert	Lewis, Colo.	Shafer
Heffernan	Ludlow	Sheridan
Hendricks	McKenzie	Sikes
Hess	McMurray	Smith, W. Va.
Hill	Merritt	Snyder
Hinshaw	Michener	Somers, N. Y.
Hoffman	Miller, Pa.	Stefan
Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.	Stevenson
Jackson	Morrison, N. C.	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Myers	Sundstrom
Jensen	Newsome	Taylor
Johnson	Norton	Tibbott
Anton J.	O'Connor	Treadway
Johnson	O'Leary	Troutman
Calvin D.	O'Toole	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson	Peterson, Fla.	Wadsworth
Luther A.	Pfeifer	Welch, Ohio
Jones	Philbin	Weiss
Judd	Pittenger	Wene
Kearney	Plumley	West
Kee	Powers	Whichel, Ga.
Keefe	Pracht	Winter
Kelley	Rabaut	Wolfenden, Pa.
Keogh	Ramey	
Kerr	Ramspeck	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 281 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

#### REPRESENTATIVE EUGENE E. COX

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I never gave my heart and my hand to another in friendship but that they were his forever, and nothing has delighted me more than hazarding injury by going to his aid in time of stress. This sweet manner of receiving me with such gracious applause evidences to me that the Members of the House have this same devotion to this highest of human relationships.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, now, I have been the object of bitter and scurrilous attacks.

Day after day the poisoned shafts of slander have been driven through my heart. Every effort to tear down and to destroy a reputation I have spent a lifetime in building has been put forth. All this is something that I have been compelled to endure in silence. My hands have been tied—tied by the chairmanship of the select committee of this House to investigate the F. C. C.

This chairmanship has compelled me to maintain a judicial attitude which cannot longer be done in the face of the insults and the slander being hurled at me from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, that which is being dealt out to me is a sorry wage for a service I have tried to render in the interests of my fellow men.

It is a difficult thing—a terribly difficult thing—for a man to sit silent under the lashes of slander and falsehood such as have been laid upon me. But so long as silence appeared to be in the best interest of the operations of the select committee of which I am the chairman, it was the part of wisdom and good administration for me to do so.

The first consideration must be the integrity and effectiveness of the work

of the committee of which I am chairman. The utterly baseless personal attacks upon me have beclouded the real issue of whether the Federal Communications Commission has been guilty or not guilty of the acts of maladministration with which it has been charged, and which this committee was directed by the House to investigate. The House and the country are deeply concerned to ascertain the facts about the F. C. C. without prejudice, and free of personal controversies.

As long as I am connected with the investigation it is obvious that the effort will be made to divert public attention from the real issue of alleged maladministration of the affairs of the F. C. C. to a personal controversy.

In my judicial career when a case arose in which my own personality was involved or my impartiality was questioned, it was my practice to eliminate myself from the trial of the case. While such a custom does not prevail in investigations by legislative bodies, I have, nevertheless, reached the conclusion that in the light of the circumstances and the nature of the controversy in this instance, I may well follow that course.

The truth of this personal controversy and my complete vindication will come at another time and in another way. It cannot be attempted on this floor in the limited time I have at my command and this is not the time for such an effort.

I do want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I face my colleagues in the House—those who have known me and who have been my warm and cherished friends over the years—with an absolutely clear conscience. The work the committee has begun must be completed. The evils at which the inquiry is directed must be eradicated. Unless this is done, one of our most cherished freedoms will become but an empty phrase.

Mr. Speaker, this is a hard thing for a man to do. It is an unhappy thing for a man to have to do, and if my own interests alone were at issue I could not do it. But, Mr. Speaker, the first duty of every Member of this House is to consider the welfare and the effectiveness of the House itself. Its interests are incomparably greater than the interests—even the right of justice—attaching to any individual Member. The next duty of a Member of this body is the welfare of the various instrumentalities it creates to carry out its will—whether those instrumentalities be independent agencies or standing or select committees. Any Member who loves this body as we all love it, who takes pride and deep satisfaction in being a part of its honored membership, must put before himself, before his own interests, before even justice to himself, the best interests of the House. Consequently, the action I take today is based solely upon my conscientious and deep desire to live up to the most sacred obligations of this body and to my oath as a Member of it.

Mr. Speaker, moved by these considerations, and fortified by the concurrence of friends in this House in whose friendship and judgment I have the utmost

confidence, I tender you my resignation as chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. Its work thus far has been well done. Its membership is excellent. Its staff is composed of men and women who are able, conscientious, and skilled in the work they have undertaken. This committee must continue its work under a new chairman, freed of any possible embarrassment of my personal problems or controversies. I thank you for the honor of having named me chairman of the committee, and for your expressed confidence in my administration of its affairs. I urge the House to support, to continue and to stand solidly back of the work of the committee under its new chairman, whoever he may be.

So far as I am personally concerned, my love and admiration for this House, my devotion to its ideals, make it a matter of pride with me that I, as one of its Members, efface myself so that the work of one of its committees may go forward. Let no man mistake me. I shall continue to make the fight where I find it. I leave the Well of this House today with my head unbowed and with my devotion to my duties undimmed.

The SPEAKER. The resignation of the gentleman from Georgia is accepted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement just made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] indicates his high courage and unselfishness. No enemy could have compelled him to relinquish his special committee assignment. Threats and vicious abuse would have been shrugged aside with disdain and contempt. Vilification and slander he has ignored. Yet, his nobility of character would not permit him to continue in a place that might cause embarrassment to the House, to his colleagues, and his friends. It is apparent to all of us that unselfishness and a high regard for the sensibilities of his colleagues in this House have been the only motives which prompted the gentleman from Georgia to follow the course that he has taken. The people of the district the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] so ably represents, I know are proud of his services. His unselfish act of today will make them feel prouder of him, and of his high and noble character, and of his courage.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague in applauding the unselfishness of our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He has the courage in a situation difficult to him personally to be big enough in mind and in heart to efface himself, and to leave a position because he thinks that the thing that is near to his heart may be jeopardized by his presence upon this special committee. And I say to this House,

after 20 years of intimate association with the gentleman from Georgia, GENE COX, during which he has had my friendship and my love and my confidence, that today that love and that confidence in his honor and in his integrity is unshaken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the utterances of the Speaker of this House contribute one of the finest compliments that any Member of the House has ever received in the constitutional history of our country, or that any Member ever will receive in the future. The Speaker is the presiding officer of this body. The gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN possesses the confidence and respect of everybody, without regard to party. No fairer man has ever presided on the rostrum of this House than our present distinguished and beloved Speaker, and his words carry force and weight, not only in this body, but throughout the length and breadth of this country, because the people of this country have confidence in the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

One of the elements of greatness is willingness to make sacrifices. Today we have witnessed one of the finest acts of sacrifice that has ever taken place, particularly in this chamber.

As to the honesty and integrity of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] there is no question. He is above reproach. Any attempt to besmear or besmirch his name will be defeated because it is impossible, no matter how cheap the efforts might be, to prevent the people of this country from knowing the truth on the question of the honesty of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. His honesty and integrity are clearly evidenced to the people of America by the splendid, spontaneous, and unanimous reception that he has received on this occasion.

I hesitate to proceed further and I will conclude by making this short statement. You and I, my colleagues, have today witnessed the greatest act of personal sacrifice that any man has ever made who has ever been a Member of this distinguished body. Great as he has been as a Member of this body in the past in the estimation of his colleagues and his friends, the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, has risen today to a greatness that impresses itself not only upon the Members of our body but of the people of the entire United States. He has made a great personal sacrifice in order that the integrity of this great body might be maintained in the minds and in the eyes of the American people. I know I express the thoughts and sentiments of every one of my colleagues when I convey to the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, our deep feelings of appreciation and our profound thanks for the great personal sacrifice he has made today.



## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my membership on the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Very respectfully,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

The SPEAKER. With objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk several resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 309

Resolved, That EDWARD O. McCOWEN, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 310

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, to wit: HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., of Pennsylvania, and CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 311

Resolved, That JAMES GALLAGHER, Sr., of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 312

Resolved, That ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain editorials about the late editor of the New York Sun, Frank M. O'Brien.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## ABRIDGING FREEDOM OF SPEECH BY RADIO OR WIRE COMMUNICATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution. When that amendment is adopted, and I hope it is adopted in the very near future, it will be known as the twenty-second

amendment to the Constitution. It has to do with freedom of speech on the radio.

Radio has become such an important factor in the shaping up of public opinion that there has been a tendency by Government officials, broadcasting officials, and various organizations to impose a direct or indirect censorship on radio discussions. Such censorship is not in the interests of the development of a free American public opinion.

The American people are able to formulate their own judgments. They must have their information brought to them without interference from those who do not entertain the true value of the public mind, established by our successful history founded on the judgments of all Americans after free public debate on the numerous issues solved during the course of this country's life.

The more serious tendency toward censorship lies in the efforts to make our courts lean toward censorship restrictions on radio communications because broadcasting for physical reasons is necessarily subjected to a licensing or a franchise system.

There really should not be any question but that the provisions of the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution apply to radio. But, because of the tendency to differentiate speech through licensed communication from ordinary speech, as far as freedom is concerned, it has become imperative that Congress and the people speak more pointedly on this question through a referendum in the form of my proposed amendment.

I have purposely refrained from attaching directly new language to the first and fourteenth amendments because these two amendments are so sacred to the American people and now so succinctly express the basic American creed that any tampering with their form might be viewed as a profanation.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and a free press not only are the great objectives of our system but are, as well, the guaranties of its continuance.

Americans are not a namby-pamby people. They can take strong stuff over the air just as they can give strong medicine to our enemies on the field of battle. The forthright leaders of the past—those men who guided America to its present high position—were never mollicoddles in the use of language and there is no reason for the belief that leaders on the air today should pull their punches in castigating inimical movements.

If a speech on the air offends a listener, the dial can always be turned away from the broadcaster who is offending as far as a particular listener is concerned. We want our broadcasting to be forthright and we want our facts accurately reported. We will pass our own judgments.

At present, through a filter system, composed of the Federal Communications System and those who control the licensed broadcasting systems, our broadcasting has been diluted to the degree where it has become so neutral as to be ineffective. We want strong speech from strong men on the air, not synthetic un-

derstatements from pulpitiereing puppets. An example of the worth of strong free speech is in the broadcasts of Walter Winchell. He helped to awaken America to the danger of the fifth column and his sharp attacks on it over the air did much to destroy it. He aroused public opinion to such an extent that the work of the enemy in our midst has been ineffective. Censorship that would have stopped Winchell in these attacks would have been disastrous to the country.

There are other able commentators on the air who have fearlessly pointed out to the people things that were destructive and these men should not be hampered because higher-ups do not share their views or approve of their methods of expression.

America can only live while speech is free and the most important of all speech is speech by radio.

Following is a copy of my resolution:

House Joint Resolution 168

Joint resolution—Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication

Resolved, etc., That the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding the following article:

AMENDMENT 22, SECTION 1. Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication.

SEC. 2. The provisions of any law, license, or contract in violation of section 1 hereof are hereby declared inoperative.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] at the dedication of a river terminal at Guntersville, Ala.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO INVESTIGATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 716) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. No. 38) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the

Seventy-eighth Congress on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article written by me and which appeared in the September issue of the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

#### THE GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no study made in reference to the gasoline situation that has found that there is not sufficient gasoline in the United States to take care of those individuals who must have it to carry on their lawful occupation.

A great many salesmen, a number of cream and poultry buyers and others are and will be forced out of business because of the recent cut in their gasoline rations. All of these individuals are carrying on a part of the important necessary work of our country. Some of these individuals are well along in years. They cannot go to the factory or the farm. They are just out of business.

To limit a salesman to 120 miles of travel a week might be all right in some territories, but out in the wide open spaces of our agricultural States, it is not enough. Is there any good reason why, after the military needs are met, the individual who must have gasoline to stay in business should not be taken care of next?

One traveling man has sent me the following letter, which, in my opinion, carries a great deal of truth:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: While the O. P. A., under orders, of course, from the New Deal, is starving traveling salesmen to death by cutting their gas to 120 miles a week, the World Herald, of Omaha, of this date, had on its sport page an item telling of the Lowry Field, of Denver, football team being taken to Fort Riley in six-count them—six bombers to play football there today. Why, they will use enough gas to run all the salesmen in Nebraska a week, if they were permitted enough gas to cover their entire territories. Of course, I am not mentioning anything at all about Eleanor wasting gas all over the face of the earth.

Among the salesmen and others who must have gasoline to carry on are found some of our finest citizens. They are paying taxes, buying bonds, giving their sons, husbands, and fathers to the armed services. They are not receiving the consideration that they should have in the rationing of gasoline. They have been discriminated against since gasoline rationing first began. Those officials who make the rules and regulations for gasoline rationing should get acquainted with the work that these men are doing, or somebody else should take their places.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that our salesmen and others who must travel can be given more gasoline.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Mr. George W. Vaught, notwithstanding the fact that it contains two and a half pages, and I am advised by the Government Printing Office that it will cost \$105.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement by the dairy industry of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article by former Ambassador William C. Bullitt, which appeared recently in the Polish Catholic Press Weekly Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article on the life and history of the Navy of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### MILITARY LEAVE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in behalf of our soldiers who are not in position to have furloughs or leave.

I wish to point out that with members of the armed forces stationed all over the world some in training in this country, others on active fighting fronts, and still others in strategic locations which have not yet become combat areas, it is impossible for the Army and Navy to grant uniform leaves of absence or furloughs. Of necessity the decision of the commanding officer in the light of particular circumstances has to govern what, if any, leaves or furloughs can be granted. Accordingly, some members of the service might receive 30 days leave or furlough a year and others none at all.

It seems only fair that members of the armed forces who, because of the particular nature of their assignment are prohibited from taking leave, should at least receive compensation for the unused leave to which they are normally entitled. The accumulation of leave is directly conditioned upon length of service rendered. Under a bill I have today offered, the members of the armed forces upon discharge from service will be credited with accumulated leave and paid a lump sum payment in settlement of unused leave. It will represent an earned personal savings fund that will be available to the individual to use in any manner he or she may choose.

I wish to emphasize that in no way is this accumulated leave pay to be considered a part of or substitute for whatever general termination pay or benefits the Congress might decide should be given to members of the armed forces at the termination of the war.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own



remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from Mr. N. V. Duncan, of Fairfield, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the officers of the Farmers' Union of Peake, Local No. 1541, of Pleasanton, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE WAR BOND CAMPAIGN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently and during the Third War Loan Drive, in Delaware County, in the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, which I have the high honor to represent, the director and chairman of that war-loan drive found it necessary for members of his organization to drive automobiles over that county in making personal solicitation for bond sales, and this required gasoline in excess of the coupons which those solicitors had.

The local War Price and Ration Board was contacted in an effort to secure extra coupons for gasoline in order to effectively carry on this campaign for the sale of War bonds but this request was refused by that board.

Then, in a frantic effort to secure some extra gasoline coupons, for the purpose of completing the sale of War bonds in that county, the chairman and director of the drive made a request to the State director of the war price and rationing, and he, likewise, refused to grant this very reasonable request.

The good people of that county continued their efforts to sell Government

bonds by walking—many of them walking great distances to contact prospective purchasers—but they finally completed their quota, and sold all bonds allotted to that county. That is the spirit of the people in Indiana.

While the people in my district were walking and selling Government bonds to aid in the prosecution of this war, many bureaucrats in Washington, who will draw their wages and salaries from the very money those people were collecting in the sales they made of bonds, were riding in large automobiles, purchased by the Government, with an unlimited supply of gasoline, paid for and provided by the people of this Nation. This policy is entirely unfair, and these people will have something to say on this subject in the future.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### REMOVE THE O. P. A. CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to remove the O. P. A. ceiling price of \$1.07 a bushel on corn, effective November 1, 1943, and let it seek its own level and open the road for the sale of middle western corn to the farmers in the Eastern States. Unless this is done immediately, there will be practically no corn for eastern poultrymen and dairymen, seriously affecting the production of these vital food commodities.

The poultry and dairy herds in the East cannot live on continued alibis, excuses, and promises of relief from the Federal Government. It must be obvious that there will be very little sale and shipment of corn from the Western States unless the ceiling price of \$1.07 is taken off and corn permitted to reach a level whereby it will be profitable for the growers in Iowa and other Middle Western States to sell to eastern farmers and industries.

The responsibility rests upon the Congress, now that the commitment made by Chester Davis, former War Food Administrator, that there would be no advance in the price of corn before October 31, 1943, is about to expire, to remedy this situation by legislative action. It would have, perhaps, been unfair to do so prior to that date, as a definite commitment had been made by the Department of Agriculture. But the Congress should now act immediately to remove the ceiling price as of November 1, and start corn moving to the East. We must have corn for our poultry, our dairy cows, and our industries, including vital war industries, now, and not 6 months from now.

The situation is critical, and unless Congress acts to afford immediate relief to the eastern farmers by providing them with corn and feed grains, many of them, particularly the poultrymen and dairymen, will be forced to either curb production or go out of business. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest blunder and most colossal failure of all the New Deal experiments, and has all but wrecked and ruined our eastern farmers. What a tragedy it is, in view of the Government's urging the American people to raise poultry and then, when they have complied, corn is not available through New Deal blundering. The production of milk, butter, and eggs is rapidly falling off, and the supply of poultry will also next year. We are facing a food shortage which is becoming more acute every day, and it is the duty of the Congress to act now to prevent a more serious situation from developing.

The resolution I introduced today is as follows:

Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn

*Resolved, etc.,* That the order placing a ceiling price on corn by the Office of Price Administration, at \$1.07 a bushel, is hereby removed, effective November 1, 1943. No ceiling price on corn shall be placed in effect by any agency of the Government without the consent of the Congress.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 4

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us what the program for next week will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week, and there will be nothing as far as I know except such matters as may come up by unanimous consent. Should anything arise unexpectedly I will see that the House is given sufficient notice, but I do not know of anything that will come up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that the Committee on Military Affairs is conducting hearings on the soldier allotment bills. May we expect such a bill to be reported at an early date?

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the committee, here. Perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say that we started the hearings on yesterday and will probably conclude them tomorrow. I understood from the announcement of the chairman that the matter would then be referred to a subcommittee to complete the drafting of a bill, and we should finish it sometime next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And may we expect it to be brought to the floor at an early date?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's views, and I know that the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] knows my views; we are in harmony.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think something should be done.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the kindly cooperation of the majority leader in giving the green light to House Joint Resolution 155, which is now in the process of being whipped into shape and I should like to ask the majority leader if he will give us the same timely cooperation on the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] that revives the stamp plan for furnishing food to the low-income groups in the hope of getting this through immediately to take care of those people who are being pinched by the increased cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be only too glad to look into it. It is difficult for me to resist the charm of my distinguished friend, but when he also includes the other distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] he makes it practically irresistible, but I will look into the matter gladly and cooperate to the extent I can.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader, with all his great ability and influence, may possibly persuade the Military Affairs Committee to look into the fact that a quarter of a million colored boys have been rejected by the Selective Service because they cannot read or write or because something might be the matter with their teeth or that they might have flat feet. If he did so, he might find a reservoir of manpower to put into our Army in the present emergency. Does the gentleman think he could use his influence to ascertain those facts so that we may have them at the proper time?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am positive, the gentleman having made his observations, that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will take cognizance of the fact and give it consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my attention has been called to the fact that the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar is due for Monday. They will be called as usual?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has reminded me of that, as did the Parliamentarian. The bills on the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short article from the Columbus (Miss.) Commercial Dispatch, containing a letter of Lt. J. D. Franks, Jr., who lost his life in the raid on the Rumanian oil fields.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE STATE OF THE NATION FROM A CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am safe in saying that the 10 years between 1933 and 1943 will go down in our history books as the "rubber-stamp era," because it was a decade high-lighted by a subservient Congress; it was a decade in which "must" legislation predominated; it was a decade when all important bills were tailor-made in the executive departments and sent to Congress for passage. Every piece of legislation and every power asked for by the President during those 10 years, with the exception of two, were granted him. Congress did not even take the trouble to scrutinize the language nor the scope of the legislation. As a result, much loose, vague, ambiguous legislation was passed.

The two refusals during this "rubber-stamp era" were the Supreme Court packing proposal and the scheme to reorganize the Government departments—a scheme to make the executive department of the Government supreme. Both of these proposals were defeated, as you know, because an aroused people made their fears and opposition felt through a barrage of letters and telegrams of protest. I credit the newspapers of the country for the job they did at that time in arousing the people to the dangers that threatened our form of government.

I know at first hand how discouraging and disappointing this "rubber-stamp era" was, because I had to live with it and take part in it. All my campaign speeches during this "rubber-stamp era" had for their theme, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Then came the election of 1942, in which many "rubber stamp" Congressmen were defeated and new men with backbone elected in their place. This gave the country an independent-minded Congress, a well-balanced Congress, a Congress that insures a healthy, desirable condition in the legislative halls of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, last December while home for the Christmas holidays, I was bold enough to predict what the new Congress would do. I said the Congress:

First. Would pass no more New Deal legislation.

Second. Would grant no additional powers to the Executive unless actually needed for war purposes.

Third. Would clarify and speed up the war effort.

Fourth. Would reduce or do away with all subsidies.

Fifth. Would see to it that all future legislation would be specific and definite so there could be no chance for misinterpretation.

Those predictions have become established facts. The rubber-stamp Congress of the 1933-43 decade became by the election of 1942 "The Rebellious Congress," and now it begins to look as though it might become "The Cooperative Congress," because today New Deal bureaucrats are on the way out in Washington as a result of the legislative rebellion of the last 6 months, and businessmen who believe in the American system of free enterprise are now being placed in responsible positions. Cooperation therefore between the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government can become the order of the day. I sincerely hope it will.

#### LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, I have listed a few of the accomplishments of the "rebellious Congress," that I want to bring to your attention—perhaps I should call them legislative high lights:

(a) The repeal of the \$25,000 salary limitation edict of the President. That salary limitation has been a plank in the platform of the Communist Party of America during the last 10 years. It is now an avowed objective of the C. I. O. Such a provision limiting salaries had been expressly prohibited by the Congress when drafting the price-control bill. The President chose to disregard that prohibition when he issued his order. The edict was repealed by attaching a rider to the debt limitation bill in order to avoid a veto. The repeal of this edict was made an issue by Congress to discourage future arbitrary edicts not authorized by law.

(b) The Hobbs antiracketeering labor bill was passed in the House by a two-to-one vote. This measure was opposed by the White House, by the C. I. O., and by the A. F. of L. The passage of this bill was a real test of the independence of Congress, because in voting for it Members disregarded the greatest labor lobby ever mustered, paid no attention to their threats, nor did they give in to White House pressure. A two-to-one vote in the face of these things is something to write home about.

(c) Congress again proved its independence by the passage of the Smith-Connally antistrike bill over the President's veto in record time. As you know, the President has finally decided to make use of the provisions of that bill as a club to force John L. Lewis into line.

(d) Being economy-minded, this rebellious Congress liquidated four New Deal agencies, the National Resources Planning Board that had hatched out the cradle-to-grave security program, now dubbed "womb-to-tomb program"; the National Youth Administration, a special pet and protégé of Mrs. Roosevelt, with "parlor pinks," such as Aubrey Williams, at the head of it; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation that provided crop insurance at taxpayers' expense, a program neither sound nor practical; and the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department, a New Deal scheme to establish coal prices and costs of production.

(e) Congress also slashed appropriations for O. P. A. and made a drastic cut in O. W. I. appropriations, especially



its domestic propaganda branch. Besides that Congress pruned the Office of Civilian Defense, and many other New Deal useless expenditures. To be exact, this economy-minded rebellious Congress lopped off altogether \$1,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam's annual budget.

Summing up the record of the Congress for the last 6 months, I would say it has put quite a crimp in the New Deal, has reasserted its authority over the legislative processes, and has reestablished itself once again in the eyes of the people as an important arm of our Federal Government. Teamwork with the Executive is a very desirable thing, but subservience to him is something else again.

#### OUR TAX PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most constructive act of the new Congress was the passage of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan. A change in our method of collecting personal income taxes had become absolutely necessary because during the last 2 years Congress lowered the income-tax brackets so that instead of some 4,000,000 taxpayers filing returns and paying taxes we now have 44,000,000 taxpayers, most of whom know little about budgeting their expenditures, do not save ahead, and so must be placed upon a pay-as-you-earn basis. Uncle Sam, therefore, had to reach into the pay envelopes of these 40,000,000 new taxpayers in order to make certain of his tax money.

At this point I want to give you an idea of what to expect in the future tax picture. The Federal tax bill for 1943 will be about \$35,000,000,000, eight times the load it was when the New Deal took over. The administration now plans to make the tax load about fifty billions for 1944, an increase of one-third over the present load. As these are astronomical figures, a few comparisons might help.

Before the New Deal era the entire cost of the Federal Government ran around \$4,000,000,000 a year, and the interest on our public debt was about one-quarter billion dollars per year. Today the cost of the Federal Government is about \$8,000,000,000 per year, twice what it was, and the interest charge alone upon the public debt is two and one-quarter billion dollars, or nine times as much as it was in pre-New Deal days. At a conservative estimate, after the war is over the interest charges on our public debt will be over \$4,000,000,000 per year, more than the entire cost of running the Government 10 years ago.

Our total direct appropriations so far this session amount to \$115,000,000,000, which, when added to reappropriations and authorizations, make a total of about \$150,000,000,000 that Uncle Sam has available to spend during this fiscal year. Regular post-war appropriations are expected to top twenty-five billions a year. This amount will be needed to cover an enormous public works program, a greatly expanded social security program, and our enlarged national defense program. After the war is over it is proposed to appropriate \$5,000,000,000 per year for the Army and Navy, as against

a pre-war appropriation for the Army and Navy of less than \$1,000,000,000 per year. Anyone can readily see from these figures that our tax load will be a very heavy one for generations and generations to come. I need not tell you what a handicap that will be to business and industry.

#### OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, I have just read a new book upon United States foreign policy by Walter Lippmann. It is written in newspaper style and expresses good sound common sense. It is well worth reading and studying. Because I agree quite thoroughly with Lippmann's thesis and arguments, I want to brief the book for you.

Lippmann says when we adopted the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, we assumed our first obligation or commitment to protect and preserve interests outside of our own boundaries. We undertook under the Monroe Doctrine to be the guardian and protector of the Western Hemisphere from Greenland on the north to the Straits of Magellan on the south. Because England had interests that paralleled ours in this hemisphere, she agreed to underwrite our commitment and become a cosigner of our obligation, pledging the use of her Navy to back up that obligation.

When we bought Alaska in 1867 we made quite an extended commitment in the Pacific—but did not take any steps to cover that commitment. We acted then, and we have been acting ever since, in much the same way that short-sighted people do who go to the bank and make financial obligations or commitments but never prepare to meet those financial obligations when they come due.

Then, in 1898, after the Spanish-American War, we took over Guam, Wake, and other Pacific Islands, and became responsible for the Philippines, taking over an obligation or commitment to protect lands 7,000 miles away, and we still did little or nothing to prepare ourselves to live up to that obligation, when and if it ever became necessary. Theodore Roosevelt was one man who realized the responsibility and seriousness of this commitment in the Pacific. He advocated a strong Navy and stretched his authority until it cracked in order to build the Panama Canal, trying to avoid the necessity of having to build a two-ocean Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after reading Lippmann's book, one is bound to agree that the interests of England and the United States in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas are complementary, are inseparable, are mutual, and parallel to each other. Also that the long chain of islands in the Pacific that we are obligated to protect and defend must be anchored upon bases in Asia—China, India, Australia, and the Dutch East Indies—to enable us to live up to our commitment. In this connection perhaps we should point out that our whole campaign against Japan today is being conducted, and necessarily so, from British and Dutch bases, and that we must recapture Rangoon and open up the Burma Road before we can

use China as a base for offensive operations against Japan. So, in view of the commitments in both oceans, that we have made voluntarily and with our eyes open, a realistic foreign policy for us must mean:

First. That we recognize and acknowledge the commitments and obligations we have assumed outside of the United States proper and prepare ourselves to cover those commitments;

Second. That we should make alliances with those nations whose interests are mutual and complementary; and

Third. That we make our armed forces, air, sea, and land, so strong that we can when necessary carry out our obligations whenever the same are challenged.

Until we do this our foreign policy will continue to be, as it has been since 1867, in a bankrupt condition, because we have never been prepared to live up to the obligations we have assumed.

#### POST-WAR FUTURE

Now, what about our post-war future? What may we expect in the post-war period? What can business expect? What can the farmer expect? What can industry expect? I frankly confess I do not know because I do not know who is going to plan that post-war future, nor do I know who will have the task of managing that post-war future. If new dealers such as WALLACE plan it and have charge of carrying out their plans, that will be one thing. If that happens we might then predict what to expect, because we are supposed to judge the future by the past, and the past 10 years under the New Deal show a definite trend toward national socialism.

Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought in Washington concerning our post-war future. The first is the socialistic school, headed by Frankfurter, Wallace, Judge Rosenman, Hopkins, Corcoran, Cohen, Henderson, and others. Their program is based upon Government control of all business and industry. This school of thought advocates a Government program of made work, another boondoggling era, to tide us over the slack period they expect after the war. They believe we should tax away all the profits of industry, renegotiate or cancel all war contracts, in order to get the money to pay for the proposed boondoggling program.

The other school of thought is headed by Jesse Jones, Byrnes, Vinson, Hull, and others. They believe we should preserve the American system of free enterprise, should look to and expect American industry to reconvert from wartime production to peacetime production with the least possible loss of time, and while doing so keep employment at a high level. This reconversion of industry would be made possible by reserves that industry had been permitted to build up during peacetime production for that very purpose. This school of thought bases its program upon a huge reservoir of consumer demand that has been dammed up during the war period; an immense purchasing power that will be accumulated as a result of high wages and forced sav-

ings to implement that consumer demand; and adequate industrial reserves that should be allowed to accumulate, large enough to tide over the industrial reconversion period. At least 98 percent of the Republican Members of both House and the Senate belong to this second school of thought and are supporting its post-war program.

I was very much encouraged when I read that the executive council of the A. F. of L. went on record recently at a meeting in Chicago in favor of this second view of our post-war program and against another boondoggling era. The executive council declared that private industry when the war is over must provide the jobs to take care of the returning soldiers, and must also be ready to give peacetime jobs to the millions now engaged in wartime work. The council was equally insistent that capital be encouraged to make possible industrial expansion. In expressing this view it used these very significant words:

The Government should not only permit but it should stimulate opportunities to make a reasonable and fair profit for business firms that are willing to increase production and employment. These business firms must be given assurances that they will not be taxed to death.

Mr. Speaker, when American business and American labor team up and insist that the Government should encourage and not discourage business expansion; that the Government should permit a fair profit to capital, and that the Government must not tax business to death, then the post-war outlook can be considered encouraging indeed. The executive council of the A. F. of L. is to be congratulated upon its constructive pronouncement covering the post-war future.

Summarizing, I have tried to give you a bird's-eye picture of the state of the Nation from a congressional viewpoint. I want to close by repeating and by re-emphasizing my slogan during the last four national campaigns and by recommending that slogan to Members on both sides of the aisle for use in next year's campaign, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman in his opening remarks referred to the fact that in the past 6 or 8 months the Congress has given evidence of a greater independence than it has in the previous 10 years. I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the reason the Congress has become independent is that there are 40 or 50 more Republican Members in this Congress than there were in the Congresses of previous years, so that the balance of power between the minority and majority party hangs by the small number of between 10 and 15.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I think I would agree with that. That has brought about a well-balanced situation here which, of course, helps materially. I also wish to say that I have noticed many more signs of independence on the right side of the

aisle during the last 6 or 7 months than I noticed in the 6 previous years that I sat in this Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman agree that if the public of this country want the Congress to be still more independent than it is even now they should send here about 50 more Republican Congressmen?

Mr. MASON. I hesitate right there because I want at this point to reiterate and emphasize the slogan I have used in the last four national campaigns, and I appealed to both Democrats and Republicans: "We need more men and fewer mice in Congress." You can take that on both sides of the aisle if you want to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Just one more question, and this is more in the nature of a correction. When the gentleman referred to the fact that as a result of the Spanish-American War this country acquired certain islands in the Pacific, he included the Hawaiian Islands. I am sure he did not intend that.

Mr. MASON. No; they were annexed before that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has emphasized the importance of private industry being permitted to retain part of its income, to lay something by.

Mr. MASON. To accumulate reserves.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Can that be accomplished under the policies we have been pursuing for a number of years?

Mr. MASON. It cannot. That can be accomplished only by changing the policies we have been pursuing for at least 10 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman recalls that only a few years ago we amended our Revenue Act and compelled private businesses to dispose of their surplus. If they did not, they were penalized heavily.

Mr. MASON. That is where we made our mistake. We are now making the same mistake when we force renegotiation upon most of the industries of the country, when only three or four are guilty and need it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman says "We." Of course, he means the majority.

Mr. MASON. I mean the party in power.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman means the party in power, because I did not vote for any such measure, to penalize private industry for undertaking to build up a reserve to protect itself and protect the jobs of its employees.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the opening of the gentleman's splendid statement he referred to the Congresses of the past 10 years as being rubber-stamp Congresses.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would make it clear that there was a minority that opposed that rubber stamping, even though the minority was small at times. The entire Membership of the Congress should not be condemned. The gentleman should put the blame where it belongs for yielding legislative and constitutional authority to the Executive.

Mr. MASON. When I made that statement I was not distinguishing as between the majority and minority parties. I said that as a whole it was a rubber-stamp Congress. Now I think it is a rebellious Congress, on both sides of the aisle. It is because of the work of this rebellious Congress that the New Deal autocrats and bureaucrats are on their way out and businessmen are being placed in positions of power who believe in preserving the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope that demonstrates that the work of the minority for the past 10 years has finally had its effect upon a majority of the citizens of the country.

Mr. MASON. I think that is probably true. I would say that the work of the majority has become more effective now that we have a pretty well-balanced Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the air bases in other countries of the world. We note with a great deal of interest that a group of Senators has visited these bases. I do not notice a similar group from the House going around to see the various bases where we are spending millions of dollars to help in the war effort, to find out what is going to be done. I think we should have a committee from the House, from the Committee on Naval Affairs and from the Committee on Military Affairs, go around to see where we are spending our money and what is being done with it.

It seems that when a group of Senators or Representatives goes to the battle fronts of the world they are criticized, but on the other hand certain columnists and news commentators and others use Government airplanes and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars are being spent to transport them back and forth and dine and wine them and give them material for their columns and broadcasts. Does not the gentleman believe that in preference to financing these people to visit the battle fronts of the world we ought to send some of our responsible committees over there to bring back the information to us, so that we could take some part in shaping the post-war policy?

Mr. MASON. Personally, I am willing to accept the information the group of Senators brought back if the sample I saw in this morning's paper is a good sample of the information they have brought back. I approve wholeheartedly, and I for once am convinced without seeing.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's remarks



in regard to the post-war effort. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to the possible necessity of the overhauling of our income-tax laws, as they regard risk capital? This country of ours was built up by people willing to take a risk, but today, under the Internal Revenue laws, anybody who takes a risk, if he gains, all his gain is taxed from him, and if he loses, there is no compensation. I think that in the future when peace comes, the committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate should give consideration to the taxes on risk capital. We have here today over \$65,000,000,000 of savings in one form or another in the hands of the people, and I think if they will go out and help develop new industries it will put many men to work and give employment to our returning soldiers.

Mr. MASON. I agree, but I insist that the only way to do that is to support that second school of thought that I discussed so briefly.

Mr. DEWEY. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. In the gentleman's opening remarks he spoke something concerning the amount of money that has been appropriated, and that had not been expended, but remained to be reappropriated, and said that it amounted totally to some \$150,000,000,000.

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. There being approximately \$35,000,000,000 left in last year's fiscal appropriations for reappropriation. Does the gentleman believe it is humanly possible for this administration to expend that amount of money in a year?

Mr. MASON. Do I understand the question to be whether or not I believe it is humanly possible for this administration to spend \$150,000,000,000 this year?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I would say yes, judging the future by the past. They have spent about \$100,000,000,000 this year, and they are just getting started. It ought to be very easy for them to increase the amount by \$50,000,000,000, providing WALLACE and his kind have the handling of it.

Mr. ROWE. One other question. Being a new Member of Congress, sometimes I have been a little nonplussed that we approach many serious problems, but seem to be bereft of pertinent information respecting them, and I think I heard our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] remark something about specialists being employed by this Congress to give proper information so that it may be available for us with which to approach this question of spending money more intelligently in the future than in the past. Does the gentleman believe, as an older Member of this body, that such a body of experts should be available to the House?

Mr. MASON. I certainly do, and I think this body has been remiss in the

past in not insisting on that; I think at least 10 or 15 years ago, when our budget sprung above \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman think they would contribute in some degree to the solution of the query just raised by another Member about the expenditure of money for persons dissociated from the Government to travel over the face of the earth, spending money for purposes I am sure this Congress never intended it to be spent?

Mr. MASON. I agree to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] I think refers to the House concurrent resolution that I introduced earlier, to create a joint House and Senate committee for efficiency in expenditures. I think about 5,000 copies of that resolution have been produced over the country thus far, but we have not been able to get any action by the Rules Committee. It does bring up this collateral thought. We have been so apt to accept so many of the things that are brought before us by the bureaus of the governmental agencies and nowhere is that quite so true as it is in respect to military expenditures. For instance, if the Quartermaster General says that we have to buy 65,000,000 pairs of socks, we act upon the theory that he actually needs 65,000,000 pairs of socks, and that the money should be appropriated with which to buy them. I believe the time has come for this Congress not only to scrutinize the expenditures on the home front, but the military and naval expenditures as well, because the Truman committee aptly indicated that some money could be saved in that direction. It would give, I think, enormous aid in the necessity for amortizing at some time in the future the huge service charge that will amount to \$5,000,000,000 on the basis of current interest rates, and we have to put our shoulders to the wheel of economy and efficiency on every front, if we are going to save this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### PROPAGANDA HAS NO PLACE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on the subject that political propaganda has no place in our public schools. I wish to refer in that connection to a publication entitled "My Part in This War," on which subject I spoke some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of May 1943 it was my privilege to address the House on the important subject Propaganda Has No Place in Our Public Schools, and it appears the effort to distribute propaganda in our schools is still continuing. The booklet which was published by the Consumer Education Study, which is apparently a branch of

the National Association of Secondary School Principals, a department of the National Education Association, with offices at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., under the title of "My Part in This War," is creating much comment among the teachers and school men and women throughout the country.

The title of this publication, My Part in This War, is very attractive, because every American has a part in this war; yet the contents of this publication should be carefully scrutinized and analyzed in order to get the full import of its meaning and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently I have been informed that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who purports to be a director of consumer education study, made a statement that at the time I spoke on this subject it was before I had seen and inspected this booklet, My Part in This War. I hereby refute that statement made by Mr. Briggs. At the very time I spoke on this subject in the House of Representatives I had one of these books in my possession, and when I spoke I had with me a copy of such book, which I showed to the Members of the House during my discourse. Prior to the time I spoke on that subject, I desire to enlighten that gentleman by saying I had carefully studied this propaganda booklet, and I copied extracts from it, which parts were used in my address at that time. I was fully advised and I knew whereof I was speaking when I addressed myself to this subject. The copy of this much-publicized booklet which I then had possession of, and which copy I still retain, was purchased by me from the National Education Association, at its office, at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Would the gentleman enlighten the House as to whether or not this National Education Association is a private association or is it financed by the Government, or whether it has any connection with the Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not know whether it is financed by the Government or not. I know that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who is a part of it, has been connected with the Government, and to that extent, at least, he has participated in the publication of this booklet, as you will observe as I proceed further in this discourse, and a Mr. Marcus Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., rewrote the manuscript, according to a statement which is contained in this book.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The National Education Association is chartered by Congress. It has nothing to do with the administration or the Government but is supported by contributions from teachers all over the United States, as members of the association.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is exactly what I knew and I wanted the RECORD to show that it is not a Government organization.

Mr. SPRINGER. Thanks for those contributions. However, Mr. Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., had his part in the preparation of this publication. Now, may I proceed with my statement?

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must report that this organization, or group, or some one of them, still persists in its efforts to place this booklet in our public schools as a textbook. In my own State of Indiana, many efforts have been made to place this book, *My Part in This War*, in our public schools as a textbook. The success of this effort is unknown to me, but I have received letters from school men and women entirely disapproving of this book as a textbook in our public schools. They rejected it because it was filled with propaganda on controversial political issues, which they deemed improper for dissemination among the boys and girls in our public schools. The book is especially prepared for use in our schools, because instructions are set forth in it to the teachers, and many questions have been prepared for the students, of which the following are but a few:

What new courses are being offered to your school as a result of the war?

How has your school contributed to the war effort besides by revising its curriculum? Survey the war-time activities of your teachers.

Many other like, and similar questions, are propounded which leaves no doubt in our minds regarding its ultimate purpose. It is intended as a textbook in our public schools, and this fact is causing great concern among our people.

The question naturally comes, Why should the people be concerned about this publication?

After making a careful study of this book, the method of presenting the propaganda therein contained and the cunning method of establishing a definite conclusion is completely revealed. The most lasting impression on the mind is created during the formative age of youth, and these are apt to become the definite conclusion of the adult. Are we to sit idly by and permit future national policies and economic philosophies to be planted in the minds of our school children? Should we permit a resort to the methods of exploitation contained in *Mein Kampf* in this country? Will we permit the curriculum in our public schools to include political propaganda? Remember, if we stand by and permit this character of propaganda to be spread through our public schools we may be lending our aid to a complete change of our standards, to a reorganization of our domestic economy and even to a change of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced our people are not ready to abandon our American way of life. However, if we fail to counteract this character of propaganda the time may come when we will find ourselves helpless to prevent such a change.

Let me refer to a few of the pertinent paragraphs of this propaganda, which are contained in this book, *My Part in This War*.

I praise the F. S. A., which is a very controversial issue of political character.

There is contained in it an article wherein grade labeling is urged. This is another highly controversial issue, and one which is recognized as political in nature.

It refers to the collection of taxes and it pays particular attention to the pay-as-you-go plan, by negative suggestion, and concludes with this statement:

Perhaps the most important consideration to think about in regard to such a proposal is that it must not be used as a means of decreasing the total taxes to be paid.

We well remember some of the arguments presented on the tax bill, recently passed.

The frequently proposed spending tax is extolled by the writers of this book.

This propaganda production also speaks of strikes in wartime, stating they are not bad, it advocates against the enactment of a sales tax, it denounces the Ruml plan as being wrong, and it states that the President's directive fixing the top salary ceiling is still the law regardless of the action of Congress.

Some of the most pertinent questions contained in this book may be found on page 89, question 8, which are addressed to the school children, and are as follows:

What effect do the President's messages and statements have upon the people?

What is your personal reaction to them?

Many other controversial issues are presented in this book—many of which are issues presented by the New Deal.

The Indianapolis Times, one of the outstanding newspapers in Indiana, says:

There is some doubt as to how much the National Education Association actually had to do with the preparation of this booklet, since it appears under the imprint of a subdivision of a subdivision of that organization. There is a clear trace of Columbia University Teachers College, noted stronghold of leftist educational theory, across its background.

While there is no objection to a private organization distributing such booklets, if it so elects, there is every reason to object to the preparation of such a publication by a Federal agency, or by Federal employees, at public expense for a private group in time of war; and there is certainly a most serious objection against the distribution and use of this publication as a textbook in our public schools.

The foreword of this booklet makes the following statement:

In this crisis education as usual is no more justifiable than business as usual.

Can anyone deny the charge of propaganda in the face of that positive statement?

During the period of an all-out war effort we know that education suffers. The normal processes of education, business, and agriculture suffer. Yet, although education suffers now, that is no just reason for the distribution of vicious and intriguing propaganda among our boys and girls in the formative period of their lives to chart their trend of thought for the future years.

Mr. Speaker, our school children should be taught the fundamentals of government, together with a rigid course

or our Constitution, with the other usual subjects pertinent to their course of study. This should continue throughout their proper grades in the public schools. These boys and girls will only too soon be called upon to assume the responsibility of guiding the Nation. They will then determine those policies which will chart the course which will guide our destinies. They are the very ones in whom there should be instilled the concepts of government that their forefathers created, builded upon, and fought to protect and preserve. The school children of today must continue to be taught that the American way of life is soundly based on a government of the people, by the people and for the people, that our Government is a system of checks and balances, divided into three coordinate branches—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—that one cannot function without the support of the others, and, most of all, that if one is permitted to become paramount and independent of the others, democracy is dead.

Mr. Speaker, wartime economy is transient. It is like the shifting sand. If and when the individual liberties must be temporarily surrendered in time of war they must be recaptured and returned when peace comes. All wartime policies must be only temporary. Otherwise they will become a permanent national policy and economy under which our liberty and freedom will be lost forever.

While education must continue in time of war, just as in time of peace, yet there must be no substitute promulgated and no far-flung leftist idealisms promoted in our public-school system under the guise of war necessity.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our public schools must not be permitted to degenerate by turning them into propaganda agencies, regardless of the position taken on any controversial political issue by any group, organization, or governmental agency.

In the end, the people will stop this present policy, I am certain. The parents of the school boys and girls will not hesitate to urge all school authorities to critically scrutinize this and all other questionable publications offered as textbooks for use in our schools. They will question any proposed propaganda publication offered as a textbook, no matter where published, or by whom published. The theory of any group attempting to place before the youth of our land, through the medium of our public schools, any kind of controversial political propaganda is unthinkable and unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, the people expect the full and complete cooperation of their Government in placing our public schools upon a high plane—far higher than that exemplified by the sinister propaganda contained in the book *My Part in This War*—and they expect their Government to aid in stopping all attempts to disrupt the normal processes in our public schools by injecting vicious propaganda therein by placing unfit textbooks before the American youth.



Our schools must be kept free from politics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman from Indiana is entitled to the thanks of the House for exposing to the curative light of day this propaganda sheet which might affect adversely our common-school system. I wish to compliment him for his timely utterances on this very important subject.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank my friend for that fine observation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. For the information of the gentleman, let me say that in my congressional district in the city of St. Louis there are several very large high schools. They discuss political questions every week in the auditorium. They have debates upon issues that are before the public at the time. Further than that, when the national campaign is on they discuss the issues in the campaign, the platforms, and the candidates, and in the week before the election they have an unofficial election and they vote for President, Senator, Congressman, and Governor. I might say they are extremely intelligent, because in the last election the vote that those children cast, something over 2,000 of them, the result was reflected by the vote that was cast on the following Tuesday. I might say further they were intelligent because they gave me a great majority over my Republican opponent, and I was elected by a great majority over my Republican opponent.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that it is all right for the children to debate those questions, but when you take a textbook and teach them one side of an issue, that is part of their education; they get only one side of the issue and that is all they know when they are presented with a text book, such as this one which I hold in my hand.

Mr. COCHRAN. Upon that I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. That policy should not be permitted in our public schools, under any guise or pretense whatsoever.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman. I might further say that I urged upon the principal that whenever they did have a debate or whenever they had anyone come to address the children, that they have people to address them on both sides of the question pending.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct in that position. That is the only way a political matter should be handled in our public schools. All of us disapprove of the program of teaching our school children but one side of a political issue in our public schools.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand, this book is a textbook?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they are forced to study that textbook and the teachers are forced to teach that textbook, and that presents just one side of the question?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. They get but one side of the political question, and they would have presented to them, by way of a textbook, that plan which is presented by the publication to which I now refer. This, in my humble opinion, is most vicious propaganda imaginable. This book should not be permitted to be used as a textbook in our public schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of all other business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### FOUR MAJOR TASKS BEFORE THE COUNTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see such a large and enthusiastic attendance in the Chamber this afternoon and I am going to suggest to my colleagues that they move over into the mourners' benches where we can enjoy this fellowship with the least amount of physical exertion.

I am deeply grateful to you. I want to visit a little while about a number of things. I want to go back to the general things that I discussed with my people this summer. It was a good, arduous sojourn back home, and there were many, many meetings every day. I presented to them this kind of an outline: I said we had four major tasks before the country. The first one was to win the war. The second was to win the peace. The third major task was to embark upon an immediate program for the preparation of the post-war period, when probably 10,000,000 in the armed forces will be demobilized and when perhaps 20,000,000 in the defense plants of the country will have to find other creative employment. The next major proposal that I discussed with people this summer was the salvation and the preservation of freedom in our own country.

You know that sounds a little academic, but it is not so academic after all, and certainly the boys in the armed services are beginning to exhibit some anxiety and concern about it.

I had a letter recently from a lieutenant colonel in Africa. He had been

in the big show. He wrote rather informally. He said:

We are hearing so many stories from back home about the rise of bureaucracy, about the invasion of the freedom of the people.

He said:

Is that the thing we are coming back to after arduous foreign service in the armed forces of our country?

And so it is a problem with which we are going to have to be concerned. I felt a little distressed about an hour ago when an inquiry was addressed to the majority leader as to what the program will be next week and the answer is that there is no legislative program for next week. I reaffirm what I said earlier this week when I asked why they got us back on the 15th of September if we are going to do nothing. We had just as well make up our minds after all that there is a job to be done and the people expect us to do the job; that we had better shuck off this inertia, we had better slough off this lack of diligence in the public business, if we want to call it that, and get down to brass tacks and start addressing ourselves with vigor to the major problems that are on the American horizon today.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. That strikes me as rather perplexing in that I have heard not only the Speaker, who is now in the Well of the House, but many other Members who are in this body, when asked what is before us and the answers are that we have nothing. The question I want to pose is this: Who does the initiating of action—and is the progress of this body dependent upon someone who can dam away some of our rights?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Ohio that I cannot very well comment on that, of course, but I can say for myself as a Member of this body, enjoying the same prerogatives as every other Member, that if there is no program I propose to make the best kind of program I can for myself, notwithstanding the fact that I may fail in so doing. And I will come back to that in just a moment.

I want to go back to this whole question of freedom and to show how necessary it is for us to be diligent and energetic about it right now. When I come from my office every day my eyes unconsciously go to the top of the Capitol on which there stands that lady we know as Freedom. She is a little unlike any other lady you and I have ever seen. She is inanimate. She is different from most ladies we see because she weighs 7 tons. She was placed there the second of December 1863.

I presume she was already in place when Abraham Lincoln was standing on the knoll at Gettysburg on the 19th of November, just 2 weeks before Miss Freedom was dedicated, and she could hear him say, by implication at least, what he did say at Gettysburg when he posed the question which has been going

up and down the corridors of time ever since, when he asked whether a Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure; "whether a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are equal can long endure." That was the text of his eternal challenge.

Now then, for me, freedom is always synonymous with a responsible devotion to the government that was laid out by freedom such a long time ago; a Government consisting of three branches.

There was one branch to which those wise men, with great vision, gave the power of the sword; to another branch they gave the power over the purse, and to the third branch they gave the judicial authority to hear and to determine controversies. To the executive the power of the sword; the legislative with the purse, and the power to the judiciary to repel any invasion of the rights of the people. On that broad structure and basic foundation have the freedoms that made this country the greatest country on the face of the earth rested. Those wise men who gave us this form of government had a lot of experience behind them. They knew that their judges were dependent long ago upon the will of a king.

They noted that judges in King's Bench Court or in Queen's Bench, as they used to term it in English legal history, held their offices too long by sufferance of the sovereign and they got their pay only through the will of the sovereign. Knowing that, they made our judiciary quite independent. They said the judicial power shall be reposed in a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress shall create; but they went further than that. They said: "Judges shall hold office for life conditioned on good behavior." They went further. They said: "Their salaries shall not be diminished during their continuation in office." That whole framework of our judicial system emanated from the fact that they saw how judges were influenced and were dependent upon the will of the king, and they wanted to create an independent judiciary that would hear controversies of law and fact between individual and individual, between the country or the sovereign and the individual, and so stand there as a great sentinel of the basic freedoms. Jefferson recognized it.

This morning I looked at a great facsimile of the Declaration of Independence, and there in the list of grievances he pointed out just that thing, that the judges were dependent upon the will of the sovereign; so they gave us a three-branch government which is the very essence of the freedom that we enjoy. What has happened to this three-branch government?

We have certainly been at fault in our duty in this body in bargaining away the independence of the judiciary. Go back and look at section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act. It was enacted by this body, it was enacted by the Senate, it went through conference and was signed by the President and then went out through the country:

No State, Federal, or Territorial court except the special emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction of any question that relates to a price regulation or to a price schedule.

This very solemn body of which you and I are Members put that on the law books. Is it any wonder then that a three-man court in Peoria consisting of two former Members of this House and one other should, after they heard an appeal for a restraining order against the O. P. A., state to all the world:

This is but the culmination of a long series of acts by the Congress which have deprived the Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

A rather amazing thing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman intend to have the RECORD indicate that all the Members of this body approved that section of the Price Control Act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they voted for it, they approved it.

Mr. CURTIS. Many of us, of course, did not vote for the act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well, that makes an exception for those Members.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not vote for that act, but even some of our colleagues who may have accepted price control as a necessity may have been—

Mr. DIRKSEN. May have accepted it, I take it, as a necessary evil?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the damage was done, and the thing I allude to is that that is but one of a number of acts through which we have impaired the power of the judiciary and the independence of the judiciary as one of the bulwarks of freedom in this country.

Mr. CURTIS. I will try to be brief if I may ask one more question along that line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. We also placed in the act a prohibition against changing the course of doing business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. CURTIS. That was called to the attention of certain O. P. A. officials not long ago; they smiled and said: "We do not proceed under the Price Control Act; we proceed under directives from the President."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What difference does it make what we put in the law if no bureau has any respect for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We shall see. It does make some difference what we put into the law about the judiciary, because if any citizen had been able to get a hearing in that court and could have gotten approval of a restraining order that would have put an end to that kind of business on the part of O. P. A. I discussed this matter the other day. The thing I want to emphasize here and now is that we are not wholly clean in the matter of impairing the authority of the judiciary in restraining the bureaucracy that treads upon the sacred rights of the people. That is No. 1. The other

thing I want to allude to is this: The executive branch is now doing by indirection, it would seem, what long ago used to be done by a species of polite intimidation. Do you remember in 1937 when the celebrated Court-packing matter was being ventilated in the Senate? I remember people writing me with stubby pencils on pieces of wrapping paper: "Dear Mr. DIRKSEN, do not let them pack the Court." In some instances they could hardly spell, and yet there had been drilled into them a great and sacred respect for the institutions of the country which made this a great country.

So the Court-packing scheme came along in 1937. It failed because of the great reverence that was drilled into the people in the little old red schoolhouses of long ago.

But now what is happening? How many Federal judges are today in the executive branch of the Government? How many have been taken from the Supreme Court of the United States? How many have been taken from the special courts right here in Washington, D. C.? Only one so far as I know has actually resigned his position, and that is Justice Byrnes. I notice that the others are on leave. And when this business is over what happens? They go back to the Federal bench from the executive branch.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Judge Vinson resigned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not notice that he resigned. He is carried in the May 1943 edition of the Congressional Directory as still being on the court.

Mr. PATMAN. He was required to. The others are not required to resign because they are members of statutory courts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have looked as nearly I could for the record. There are some on leave from the judiciary working in the executive branch and they will go back.

Will they disqualify themselves when they go back on the bench to pass on matters that came before them when they were a member of the executive branch of the Government? It is rather singular, is it not? While we have been impairing the jurisdiction of the courts, members are being taken from the benches of the country, their ability duly appraised, and asked to handle jobs of major import in the executive branch.

I am wondering how long that is going to continue and if they are going to preserve their places on the Federal benches of the country. I allude to that because you see here we begin to make little assaults upon the independence of the three branches of government that were set up in this structure long ago and that still constitute, I think, the best guarantee of a continued freedom in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DIRKSEN].



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is referring to what will happen if these judges go back to their own courts. The gentleman is no doubt familiar with a situation which is represented by legislation now pending in the Judiciary Committee where our Supreme Court has been by Presidential appointment so thoroughly packed with former Federal administrators that there is grave danger that the Court will not have a quorum qualified to sit, a majority of the Court in many cases being disqualified to sit because they are passing on acts in which they took part as administrators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct. How serious is all this? It is pretty serious. The other day when I made some observations on this floor, my friend from Texas for whom I have a genuine affection and whose high ability as a public servant I recognize, took time to follow me and to say that if the proposal I made to discharge the committee considering the Wolcott bill so that we can restore jurisdiction to the Federal courts should prevail, it would kill the O. P. A. That, as anyone knows, is an obvious exaggeration and overstatement.

Here is what he said:

If you were to pass a price-control bill and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices.

He has no faith in the Federal judiciary of the country. He wants to put it all in this emergency court of appeals and keep it there. They have done most of their business in Washington and they have not been accessible to the litigants, rich and poor in the country, as Mr. Ginsburg told the Banking and Currency Committee when the price-control bill was before that committee in 1941.

So my friend from Texas, who is a very able lawyer and one of the most astute Members of this House, says it would not do to put this jurisdiction in the Federal courts of the country. I would never make that confession on this floor. If I am going to confess that I have no faith in the Federal judges of the country, a good many of whom have been appointed by the leader of his own party, then I would confess my lack of faith in our democratic processes and say that they are about to dismember the very integrity and sanctity of this great institution known as our Republic. You might as well then give it back to the Indians. It is a rather singular thing.

When an able lawyer like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that it would not do to intrust this power to the Federal judges of the country, what happens to our faith in the judiciary and the three branches of government as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution? I say I am alarmed about

it, for when the courts are divested of jurisdiction and the citizen can no longer go to an accessible, untrammelled judiciary for a redress of his grievances, the power of bureaus and administrative agencies will be complete and the disintegration of the Republic is well under way.

Let me give you a quotation that appeared in this morning's paper, and this comes from the State of our distinguished friend, namely, the State of Texas. They had some abuse down there in connection with gasoline coupons. One of the O. P. A. hearing administrators went down to hold a hearing. What did he do? Was he content to find the operator of this filling station guilty and fine him? Oh, indeed not. Was he content to discipline or to admonish him? Oh, indeed not. He went infinitely further. He decreed that they had to go out of business.

So they appealed. To what instrumentality in the country? They appealed in this particular case to a Federal judge, because it is one of the few remaining things that you can still bring before a judge under O. P. A. That judge's name is Atwell. Here is what Judge Atwell had to say about this O. P. A. administrator, since it was an administrative hearing:

The hearing administrator, unknown to and unprovided for by Congress, presumes to conduct a court.

That is evidently all right with the gentleman from Texas, because he believes in O. P. A. just as it is, and that it is getting along all right with this special Emergency Court of Appeals. The Federal judge goes on further and says:

He acts without fear of consequence for his malfeasance or misfeasance. If he can suspend for 2 weeks, he can suspend for 2 years. He is not only unknown to the Congress but he is unknown to the Constitution. What the hearing administrator thinks is beyond the reach of Executive forgiveness. He himself is beyond reach of any constitutional removing group. He is a modern instance of pure dictatorship.

That was by a judge in the great Lone Star State of Texas, a very substantial portion of which is so ably represented by the gentleman from Texarkana. If it is all right for a Federal judge to pass on controversies involving violations of O. P. A. regulations, why should he not also have authority to pass on regulations which threaten the very life and existence of a citizen's business and livelihood?

You wonder when these things come to light as to what is going to happen to freedom in this country. When these administrators issue rules and regulations and somehow we abet their actions by making it impossible for people to get into an accessible Federal court, and then a great many of our judges are then merged in the executive branch, having not even resigned their positions on the judiciary, what happens to the pillars of the Constitution about which Webster so ably and so eloquently declaimed long ago?

So I am concerned about freedom as one of the great major problems before the country, even as it is now seeping into the consciousness of the boys who

are in the armed services and who write back to their Congressmen, their friends, their Senators, and say, "What kind of strange metamorphosis is taking place back in the old home country at the present time?"

What a tragedy if some day they come back and we must make confession as to how we failed to hold the ramparts of freedom on the home front. You see, they are coming back some day. There is going to be a great homecoming. Why, there will be a homecoming in every community, large and small, throughout this broad land. Can you not imagine it? I imagine it in terms of my own discharge from the Army a generation ago, when I telegraphed my mother from Camp Dodge, Iowa, and said, "Mother, I will be home on a certain day."

I knew what was going to happen. She was going to be there. Why, a hero was coming home. Every soldier is a hero. So heroes are coming home, many million strong. The house will be cleaned from cellar to garret. There will be a chocolate cake on the kitchen table. His girl's picture is going to be there on the little table in the front room, right alongside of the Holy Bible. His mother is going to start looking out of the kitchen window days before he ever arrives.

Then comes that day, and he is going to hop up those steps of the old home and put his arms around her, and her loving arms will encircle him as she says, "Oh, my son, you are back." "Yes, Ma, I am back." So there will be tea and there will be chocolate cake, and there will be that great homecoming when the crystal tears of the mother drop upon the shoulders of the soldier son.

Then he is going to tell where he has been. Why, he left Peoria and they sent him to a classification center. Then they sent him to San Diego or Camp Wolters or some other camp, and after a while he landed in Guadalcanal. Maybe he was in the battle at Salerno, or he was in the battle of Naples, or he was in that group that went into Berlin and Tokyo when that great day comes. He is going to give a great running recital of his accounting as a member of the armed services, of how he fought for the four freedoms. Oh, what a great homecoming that will be.

Then when that recital is all over he is going to say, "Ma, what has been happening back home while I was gone?" Maybe he was in the Army a year, 2 years, 3 years. So then he will ask for an accounting of our stewardship. What have we been doing? That is going to be the great question, and there is going to be no dodging it. You and I and all the other millions on the home front are going to have to answer that question. If we must confess in that day that we have become the victims of the bureaus, that notwithstanding the solemnity of this body and its independent part in the constitutional structure, the only thing we can do is raise our voices in protest and chop out appropriations and tie restrictions onto appropriation bills, and make a feeble and ineffectual protest, it is going to be a pretty sad accounting. So something must be done

on the home front of freedom so that there will be no frustration.

I have said so often that the most frustrated man in all history was Moses. You remember he led the children of Israel through the wilderness. Forty years he was their spiritual leader. He did everything. Remember when they came to the spring with the bitter water, and the Lord pointed out and showed Moses the tree from which to take a bough and put it in the spring that the waters might be sweet? All those things he did. And at the end of 40 years, there out yonder was the promised land. Here was this great old man, this great leader, sitting up on that little mountain looking out into the distance, because there was the lush verdure of Judah, there was the place to which he had been directing their energies for 40 years. He wanted to go there so badly, as the culmination of a great ambition.

Then the Lord spoke out of the vaults of the heavens, and what did he say? He said, "Moses, I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither." Listen to me, Moses. It is the Lord speaking. Lift your eyes and look out yonder. There is the promised land. You have been moving out to that objective for 40 years. There it is, Moses. You cannot go there now. But no. "I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

Will there be frustrations like that when the boys come back, when they have battled in all the corners of the earth for freedom? Will they come back home and lift their eyes like Ishmael of old and say, "That gracious freedom under which we had free enterprise, under which people moved along voluntarily to do the chores of government when they were called upon to do so, that freedom under which they sacrificed so willingly and so gladly, that freedom that builded here this great country, the greatest republic in all the earth, could it be that from its shores freedom should either have vanished or be badly impaired, first at the hands of Congress, charged to preserve it, second, at the hands of the Executive, charged to enforce and uphold it, and third, at the hands of the bureaucracy, that would sabotage it?"

Can we not do something about it? Let us make a little start. I filed a discharge petition yesterday on the Wolcott bill, on which we voted as a substitute or an amendment, when the price control act was before us in November 1941. I probably cannot get a hearing on my bill over in the Banking and Currency Committee. This bill has been in that committee more than 30 days. That is why I am filing a petition to discharge the committee. I am interested in one paragraph of that bill, paragraph 2 (a)—that notwithstanding any power that is conferred upon O. P. A., the right of the citizen to go into a Federal court to secure redress of his grievances shall not be denied. That is the message that America wants to hear. They have got their fighting clothes on in the country today. They want us to do something about it, but there is not going to be any legislative schedule next

week. You better go and sign petition No. 13 on the Clerk's desk and let us get going, in the interest of the people of this great Republic who still have faith in the institutions of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other regular orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some letters written by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] for 10 minutes.

#### ALUMINA FROM CLAY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the great hydroelectric plants in the Columbia River Basin, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are supplying the cheapest hydroelectric power in the United States. This vast reservoir of power is now being used for the production of aluminum and the providing of other war facilities to win the war. Over one-third of our aluminum supply for airplanes is coming from this one area. In one of these plants, the Vancouver plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, there has been produced enough aluminum to build 90,064 modern fighting planes.

The Federal Government has a combined investment in Bonneville and Grand Coulee, including distribution lines and facilities, of approximately \$400,000,000. There is also invested by the Government and private investors in the Pacific Northwest electro-process plants the sum of approximately \$171,000,000.

We are now importing most of the bauxite from which aluminum is made from South America, at heavy expense, both in dollars and the use of valuable shipping facilities which should be used for other war purposes. Furthermore, this supply is subject to hazards by being cut off by enemy action, which would almost completely stop aluminum production in the United States.

There are immense deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the Northwest adjacent to these huge electric plants. The aluminum content is not as heavy as bauxite but new processes have been developed for utilizing these clays for the production of alumina, otherwise known as aluminum oxide. Such production would provide an adequate supply of

material from within our own borders for the production of this most strategic product needed to win the war. A semi-commercial and pilot plant of 50-ton capacity for location in the Pacific Northwest was heretofore approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board, the Young Coordinating Committee, the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the War Department, and a preliminary approval by the Defense Plant Corporation.

This plant would only employ approximately 150 men, who, according to official surveys made, are available in the territory immediately adjacent to the clay deposits to be developed. These men would not be taken from existing war industries but are local citizens not otherwise employed in war activities. This project has now been refused the "green light" to proceed with construction on the alleged ground that there is a manpower shortage in the Pacific Northwest area. As a matter of fact, proceeding with the construction of the plant as heretofore authorized, will not in any way interfere with war production, will not take one single man from any existing war activity, and will not take any men who are otherwise available for war industries. It is believed by all of the people of the Northwest, including the delegations in Congress of all these States, that to jeopardize the successful operation of this huge investment of the Federal Government, as well as private investors, of this great industry of the Northwest by failing to take the proper steps now to utilize the local deposits of aluminum-bearing clay, is not only unwise but will jeopardize our ability to produce the much-needed aluminum for our air forces. Furthermore, the Government is vitally interested in protecting its huge investment in this great industry and providing a source of raw material which will insure its successful operation, not only in wartime but in the post-war period which will need this most useful product—aluminum. The dwindling supply of bauxite in the United States makes it necessary to take steps at once to provide adequate supply from other sources. By utilizing local clays in the vicinity of the aluminum plants, we will save valuable railroad transportation so much needed in our war effort. It is estimated that each year 16,000 freight cars will be conserved by using Northwest aluminum instead of Eastern bauxite for aluminum making. We will also save valuable cargo space on shipping from South America to our shores, greatly in demand for other war products.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact the War Manpower Commission order on this aluminum is based on a shortage of manpower, and a survey out there will show that for the construction of this plant there are actually ample men available for employment in the construction



industry because of contracts being canceled, and there are plenty of contractors. I have checked this in my district, and the gentleman has in his. I wonder if there is anything underneath this? I wonder if we are not treading on the feet of that eastern Aluminum Trust that does not want aluminum developed on the western coast.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely correct with reference to the manpower situation. I have made inquiry myself of the officials in my State, whose duty it is to know with reference to the manpower situation, and as I said in my previous remarks, only 150 men are needed to operate the plant and three or four hundred men for its construction, and they are to be found in the locality where the plant may be constructed, from groups of citizens who will not be taken from war industry, which will not interfere in the prosecution of other war industries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And I commend the gentleman and the other members of our delegation from the Pacific Northwest. We are not concerned with where they put this plant, just so they utilize the things we have in the Northwest, whether they be in the gentleman's State or my State, or in some other State in the Northwest.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct. The entire delegation is in accord with that thought.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that we may develop the power that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been talking about for so many years.

Mr. ANGELL. And may I say that the delegation of the three Northwestern States are agreed on that. There is no controversy as to where the particular plant shall be located. The only idea is that it be located in proximity to the hydroelectric power in the Northwest area, so that we may use the local clays without being compelled to bring bauxite from South America.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a process known to manufacturers of aluminum for extracting aluminum from clay, and from 25 to 40 percent of all clay is aluminum.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Aluminum is infinitely the most abundant metal in the earth. In order to utilize that process it is necessary to have an abundant supply of cheap electric power. Today we are in this position. About 66 percent of the high-grade bauxite in the world is now in enemy country. Probably 15 or 20 percent is in South America. We have not enough high-grade bauxite in the United States to supply our demands for another year, and in order to meet the demand, we are going to have to develop and utilize this process of extracting aluminum from clay.

The Aluminum Trust has done all it could to prevent the utilization of that process, because when it is put into op-

eration it will mean the death knell of the aluminum monopoly.

I have been trying for some time to get one of these pilot plants established in the Tennessee Valley area. I am willing to join the gentleman from Oregon, who is now addressing the House, and my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in their efforts to get this process put into operation along the Columbia River, because our great supply of hydroelectric power now comes from the Tennessee River and the Columbia River. By developing this process they cannot only meet our war demands, but free the American people from the clutches of the Aluminum Trust and give us an abundance of that metal for all purposes throughout all time to come.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this entire subject was discussed in a very informative article by Merlin Blais, a staff writer on the Portland Oregonian, appearing in the September issue of Mining World. I include this article as a part of my remarks:

#### ALUMINUM—FUTURE OF INDUSTRY IN THE NORTHWEST RESTS WITH W. M. C.

(By Merlin Blais)

(Already producing nearly a third of the Nation's light metal, blessed with cheap power and alumina-bearing clays, the Pacific Northwest is fighting for the opportunity to develop a fully integrated industry after the war.)

In the Pacific Northwest aluminum has become the foremost metal industry, with an investment of \$125,000,000. Five new war plants in Washington and Oregon are spewing forth more than a half billion pounds of the fabulous light metal a year. Ten thousand men and women are advancing the war effort on the industry's pay rolls.

These five reduction plants operated by Alcoa at Vancouver, Spokane, and Troutdale, by Reynolds at Longview, and by Olin at Tacoma—are turning out fully one-third of all the pure aluminum made in the United States. Two years ago the Northwest was producing none. Today this region stands in the forefront as war ushers in a dazzling new light-metals era.

But, large as the Northwest's aluminum output now is, prospects for a permanent peacetime industry have been cloaked in doubt. Only recently have these prospects justified definite optimism. Natural resources offer an essential key to the future.

Bonneville-Grand Coulee power, cheapest electricity in the Nation, is responsible for the aluminum industry already established in this region. Power costs alone have been estimated at \$30 per ton of the metal cheaper here than in the Eastern States. This advantage will prove a potent incentive for continuing the industry at war's end.

The future may depend also upon the fortunes of a proposed \$4,000,000 alumina-from-clay plant, which, far from being built, is still in the hands of several war agencies on Capitol Hill, where it has been buffeted about among a multitude of plans to further the war output.

#### EDICT FORCED CANCELS PLANS FOR PLANT

More vital than it might seem, the long-sought plant would extract aluminum oxide from clay mined at Hobart Butte or Molalla in Oregon or at Castle Rock in Washington. After much delay, the clay-treating unit

gained approval by the War Production Board for critical materials. Then, with a trench mortar's impact, the War Manpower Commission more recently ditched the hard-won concession with a sweeping Northwest ban on new industries.

Oregon, Washington, and Idaho spokesmen have lifted hopes anew with a fighting comeback in which W. M. C. has been advised that the proposed aluminum oxide plant would need only 300 laborers for construction and 150 or fewer for its operation—none to be needed before well into 1944. Senators CHARLES L. McNARY, RUFUS HOLMAN, and MON C. WALLGREN, among its most potent champions on Capitol Hill, picture the latest prospects with obvious optimism.

Donald M. Nelson, war production czar, has acknowledged merits of the project in a letter to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, in which he commented, "We recognize there are advantages in placing an aluminum plant in that area and are therefore hopeful of finding some location which will be able to meet the necessary construction and operational requirements."

Now, why is a new \$4,000,000 plant so important to an industry which already has a half dozen operations which cost \$125,000,000? The answer concerns all 3,500,000 residents of the Pacific Northwest, particularly as chances for its realization stand high.

Besides the huge ingot-production plants already in operation, the advocated unit would add hardly a trickle to the stream of aluminum. Its 50-tons-per-day capacity of aluminum oxide—popularly called alumina—can contribute little to satiate the ravenous, 2,000-ton daily appetite of the region's busy reduction pots.

#### TWO POUNDS YIELDS ONE POUND OF VITAL METAL

A 50-ton plant is not even considered a full commercial operation, but, strange as it seems, the post-war fate of the entire aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest may hinge upon whether it is built and successfully run or not built at all. For it will utilize the Northwest's own resources—its clays, its coal and hydroelectric power, its water, and its human labor, but particularly its native clays.

Aluminum is made from aluminum oxide, or alumina. Two pounds of this white powder yields one pound of the pure metal when subjected to reduction by electricity. Richest source of alumina is bauxite ore, which contains about 60 percent. Most bauxite comes from Dutch Guiana, on South America's east coast; some is found in Arkansas and adjacent States. Alunite is another but scarcer source.

High-alumina clays contain as much as 40 percent or more, but the yield of aluminum oxide is only 30 percent or slightly less on the average. To the Northwest's aluminum industry, however, clays offer definite advantages.

Every pound of alumina now fed into the reducing pots of this region's five pig aluminum plants must make a rail journey of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from ore-treating plants in the Southeastern States. Most of the ore already has come from the Southern Hemisphere, taking much precious cargo space on freighters which might have been carrying supplies to American fighters on foreign soil.

Then more than half of the ingot or pig aluminum takes another cross-country joyride to eastern rolling mills, some of it again moving west to become bombers at Boeing's in Seattle. The new rolling mill constructed at Spokane, after a change of site from Fairview, can process about two-fifths of the Northwest's aluminum output, eliminating to that extent the wasteful round-trip haul to Eastern States.

As it operates now, the industry in Oregon and Washington has but one major advantage—its access to a vast cheap river of elec-

tricity, large blocks of which are essential. When the war's production pressures pass with the coming of peace, can this industry survive?

Metallurgists point out that, first of all, a cheaper source of aluminum oxide is practically imperative. Expanded manufacture and expanded consumer markets also are needed, but these will hark only to the call of low-price aluminum. A key to the future lies in the Northwest's own soil.

Five likely clay beds have been discovered in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The Federal Bureau of Mines has studied all five, making its most thorough test-holing at two sites in western Oregon and one in western Washington. Findings have not been announced, but it is understood that the richest deposit is at Hobart Butte, 12 miles due south of Cottage Grove, and the largest lies a few miles southeast of Molalla. The third clay bed, also of considerable size, with an estimated 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons, lies along the Toutle River east of Castle Rock.

The other principal deposits are situated near Spokane and in Latah County, northern Idaho. Improbable locations for the initial experimental plant, these will figure strongly for any expansion of clay-treating facilities.

The Northwest's struggle for an alumina-from-clay industry has confronted more than its share of obstacles and final authorization of a plant, though it may not be large, will be truly a major triumph. In the metallurgical sphere the problems were: Is there a practical process for reducing clay to aluminum oxide? And, is there enough accessible clay in the region to justify an industry?

Processes have not been lacking in number and variety. Sixty of them passed through the hands of the W. P. B.'s subagency, the Office of Production Research and Development. One of these, the Hixson process, cost two eastern concerns \$20,000 to develop to the pilot-plant stage.

#### WET CLAY MINED AND CRUSHED BEFORE TREATMENT

Among the more likely methods named for this area are the sulfuric acid process of Kalumite, Inc., a subsidiary of the Olin Corporation which runs the Tacoma reduction unit; the ammonium bisulfate process of the Chemical Construction Company, a subsidiary of the American Cyanamid Corporation, and a modified ammonium bisulfate process developed by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The initial \$4,000,000 plant, after W. P. B. approved it and before W. M. C. shelved it, was awarded by the Defense Plant Corporation to the Columbia Metals Company and the ammonium sulfate process was to be utilized. The clay is wet when mined and must be dried and crushed before being treated. Then, in this process ammonium sulfate and clay are heated to convert the aluminum oxide in the clay to soluble aluminum sulfate. The insoluble silica is filtered off and the iron is removed.

Ammonia is used then to precipitate alumina as aluminum hydrate, which is filtered and washed, then dried in a kiln where it becomes powdery white aluminum oxide. This alumina is shipped to a reduction plant, such as those operating in Longview or Troutdale, for transformation into the pure light metal. The sulfate is recovered as ammonium sulfate and reused.

Alkalis are used to reduce bauxite ores, but acid reagents appear necessary for the alumina clays. Cost of treating the latter in commercial quantities is not known definitely, but admittedly it will be much higher than for bauxite. To begin with, more clay is needed. Four tons of bauxite will yield two tons of aluminum oxide, which in turn

can be reduced by power to one ton of aluminum. Eight to ten tons of clay will be required to produce this amount.

Clay must therefore be accessible in large quantities which can be mined at low cost. The deposits must lie close to the surface and be handy to cheap transportation. Generally, the clay must not lie beneath a surface soil overburden which is thicker than the clay stratum itself.

Does the Northwest meet this requirement? A satisfactory industry, metallurgists estimate, would need about 3,000,000 tons of clay per year. Reserves of 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 and more tons would be essential to an industry with a life span of 25 years or longer.

This is a huge quantity of clay, but mining men believe the Northwest has it. The Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey has been test drilling the principal known deposits for the past year. Its findings, not announced, were a major influence in the War Production Board's approval for a pilot plant and it is believed that the Hobart Butte, Molalla, and Castle Rock deposits together contain the minimum 75,000,000 tons, at least.

Extent of the Spokane and Latah clay deposits is not known definitely, but these might justify their own plants. Other high-alumina clay beds of unknown size exist in Oregon and Washington. In northwest Oregon, for example, the richest clay yet found is in the Macleay district, 7 or 8 miles east of Salem. Another promising deposit lies near the lower Columbia River, 6 miles west of Rainier.

What about other raw materials? Second needed resource is fuel, used for furnaces, steam generation, and kiln drying. Fuel oil is the preferred heating source. A pilot plant such as that planned for the Northwest would use an estimated 6 to 8 barrels of fuel oil per ton of aluminum oxide produced.

#### BONNEVILLE PLAYS IMPORTANT ROLE WITH LOW-RATE POWER

Northwest coal can be substituted for oil in some operations and hogged fuel from the area's hundreds of sawmills can also be used. Coal from Coos Bay is suggested for use at the Hobart Butte site and Oregon authorities have given assurance that this soft coal will be laid down by rail at cheap rates by the time a plant there would need it. Coal mines of the Centralia district might supply a plant located at Castle Rock.

Low-cost Bonneville power, already a boon to ingot plants and rolling mills, offers cheap motive power and also a substitute for fuel in some operations, particularly if such a plant were located at Troutdale, Canby, or Salem, and other possible sites. More than 5,000 kilowatts are the estimated requirements for the 50-ton unit.

This alumina-from-clay set-up also would need about 100,000 gallons of water per ton of output, to be used in chemical processes and in the alumina bath which precedes kiln drying. West of the Cascades, this raises no great problem except as to water rights. The amount of ammonium sulfate needed is not known definitely.

About 150 men would be employed for regular production, it is estimated. Larger plants, of course, would need proportionately fewer men. The W. M. C.'s blanket ban on new Northwest industries interrupted the clay-plant project because of its manpower requirement in the face of an apparent labor shortage in the area.

Why the W. P. B. limited the initial project to a capacity of 50 tons per day has been a question for conjecture. First application to the War Production Board sought a 200-ton plant. This was halved to 100 tons, then slashed again to 50 tons. The region's needs for alumina exceed 2,000 tons per day.

Several commercial plants producing from 200 to 500 tons daily will be necessary if the Northwest is to become independent of distant sources of aluminum oxide. A 50-ton plant would appear puny and disappointing, indeed, but W. P. B. has explained that a modest start is best so that "bugs" found in new processes might be worked out quickly and inexpensively.

The danger, however, would lie in the chance that those opposed to an alumina-from-clay industry would point to the costs of a small, semicommercial plant as evidence that cheap production is impossible on any scale.

#### VISIONARIES WILL BE VICTORIOUS IF W. M. C. YESSES PLANT

If the Northwest wins final approval of its first clay-treating unit, that will constitute victory of the visionary over the reactionary. Its delay in spite of the war emergency reflects the sharpness of the behind-the-scenes conflict. The most public phase saw ex-Congressman Walter M. Pierce tilting his eloquent lance repeatedly against the Aluminum Co. of America, which, before war needs prompted expansion beyond Alcoa's aegis, enjoyed a virtual monopoly in this light-metal field.

Fortune magazine, in an article of May 1943, asserted that one of the clay-treating processes was retarded by veto of a National Academy of Sciences committee, which was "heavy with big-metal-company technical men."

O. P. R. D., the article went on, displayed the stated attitude that "there is enough United States bauxite for a 4-year war and its jobs is to put a completely worked-out alumina-from-clay process on the shelf ready for the next war."

#### SUB CRISIS EXPOSED DEPENDENCE ON VULNERABLE IMPORTS

The shipping crisis in the Caribbean sea of some months ago, however, shocked many economic leaders into a realization of the Nation's present utter dependence on an aluminum source which is vulnerable to enemy attack. Freighter losses have not been fully announced, but Axis submarine attacks were pressed with the knowledge that the sea lane from Surinam led into the air lane over Berlin, that its traffic was essential to the Allied war effort.

The Caribbean crisis lent belated impetus to the Northwest's fight in Washington for an alumina-from-clay industry. The campaign had its beginnings in the first report on western Oregon's refractory clays, prepared by Hewitt Wilson, University of Washington engineer, and Ray C. Treasher, geologist, for the Oregon department of geology and mineral industries.

This report, published in 1938, and similar State of Washington studies then furnished the basis for persistent plugging in the Nation's Capital. Of utmost import to this struggle has been the continuous support of Bonneville's market development section, keyed by the 1939 report of the section's director, Ivan Bloch. His statement on the Northwest's industrial possibilities stressed the prospects for local clays as a source of aluminum oxide.

The Northwest's own private capital became interested. The Columbia Metals Corporation, composed mostly of Northwest businessmen, has long had its application before the Government for a clay plant. The W. P. B.-approved unit was to be operated for a time by the Chemical Construction Corporation and later taken over by Columbia Metals, it was understood.

Its leaders, Charles F. Clise, board chairman, and J. O. Gallagher, president, both of Seattle, have indicated that whether the initial plant went to a Washington or to an Oregon site made little difference to them.



When larger clay-treating plants proved feasible, they could be built in both States, and possibly Idaho as well.

With an eye to the future, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers urges the stock-piling of critical minerals as soon as this war ends, to further preparedness for any possible prevention of a World War No. 3.

The Pacific Northwest, however, does not want merely an aluminum stock-pile industry. A full-fledged economy capable not only of creating the light metal from clay, but also of processing it and fabricating it into a multitude of articles is the region's ambition.

#### ENGINEERS BELIEVE PLANTS MAY BE SAVED FOR POST-WAR USE

After the war some of the federally financed plant capacity may be scrapped, but engineers believe that most of it can be saved if aluminum's possibilities for civilian use are really developed. Aluminum architecture, combination of aluminum and plastics, new alloys of great strength and lightness offer vast possibilities. Aluminum aircraft and trains are accepted. Aluminum ships and motor vehicles are considered early certainties.

Of importance also are other uses of aluminum oxide in the chemicals and abrasives industries. Before war production began, aluminum was priced at 20 cents a pound. It has dropped to 15 cents and will go lower. Skilled aluminum artisans now number in the thousands and they will want to make aluminum a life work.

Engineers, including those of Alcoa, are plotting a major role for light metals in the post-war world. In fact, C. C. Carr, Alcoa's public relations head, opined quite recently that the aluminum industry here will be permanent. He explained that the power cost in the ingot plants figured at only 2 cents a pound of metal produced.

The Pacific Northwest now boasts one-third of the Nation's aluminum reduction capacity. The three States possess a large source of the metal in their alumina clays, a domestic source which only invasion can cut off. Bonneville and Grand Coulee generate the cheapest power in the land. Ample skilled manpower will be available at war's end. A vast potential market lies across the Pacific, and the west coast itself has become the new population mecca.

If the aluminum industry is to flourish in this promised land, it must be expanded on the balanced aquarium principle. Several plants to process clay from Northwest mines, the present reduction facilities, perhaps another rolling mill at tidewater to augment the big Spokane mill, then numerous factories to turn out a multitude of articles from ice trays to truck bodies for household and highway—these would assure the Pacific Northwest a fabulous aluminum empire.

#### APPEALS TO THE JUDICIARY FROM DECISIONS OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of hearing the able address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but I did hear some of his statements relative to what I had said on this floor concerning the judiciary. The gentleman from Illinois left the impression that I was not willing to trust the judiciary of the country, and for that reason I was in favor of a special

court to pass on cases involving the Office of Price Administration.

I am willing to trust the judiciary. I have the utmost faith and confidence in that branch of our Government. I trust them collectively, as I trust the 531 Members of the House and the Senate. I trust the Congress. I know that what Congress does, generally, will be right, and if it is not right it will be corrected. But that does not mean that we would trust any individual Member of the House or Senate on any national problem or to deal with the whole of that problem. Not at all.

The judge to whom the gentleman referred, Judge Atwell of Texas, is a fine example of what might happen if you permitted any district court judge to grant an injunction and stop the operation of the Office of Price Administration law. In the first place, it would take months to decide the case, and during that time inflation would get out of control and we could not get it back under control after the case had been passed on.

Judge Atwell is a good man. He is, conscientiously, a Republican. He believes that way. Lawyers differ about their interpretations of the Constitution, and he sees the Constitution as he believes, conscientiously so. Now, we have about the same number of Federal judges that we have Members of the House and Senate. It is not the exact number, but approximately the number. Let us say that half of them are Democrats and half of them are Republicans. Somewhere among those 531 men you could find some judge who would grant an injunction against the enforcement of any part of the O. P. A. law. You would have it stymied all the time. You would never be able to enforce it. So if you believe as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] believes, you just could not believe that we should have an O. P. A. law at all. I cannot take issue with those who do not believe in price control. That is their judgment; but I think we must have it and I think it has saved this country from ruinous inflation. I think without price control we would have had unlimited expansion of the currency and credit and prices so high that only the very rich could exist. We would have had a spiral of inflation that we could not have stopped, and our dollars would not be worth 10 cents today.

Now, do not be swept off your feet by arguments that people are all making so much money on the inflation question. It is true that many of the war workers are making enormous sums of money, several times as much as they have made in their lives before; doubtless too much in some instances; but that does not mean that this great middle class in our country, the people who really built this country in time of peace, and those who furnish the manpower to save it in time of war, who work on fixed salaries or live on old-age assistance checks, dividends, interest payments, rents, and fixed incomes of that nature, are getting the benefit of those large wages. It is harmful to them instead of helpful. There are millions

who have not had their wages or salaries raised at all. Let us not forget them. Therefore it is necessary that we have some control over prices. If we were to allow judges all over the country to stop this law any time they wanted to, we might just as well repeal the law and go to no trouble at all, because it would always be stopped. This is war. Things happen too fast to allow certain things to take a normal course.

The gentleman from Illinois is so solicitous of the welfare of the judiciary. If you were to pursue his argument to its logical end, you would have to say in every case that we should have the judiciary of this country pass upon it. After all, they are not elected by the people. They are appointed. But even if they were elected, it makes no difference as far as this argument is concerned. There are certain cases where it is all right for other boards and courts to pass upon the matter. I cite as an outstanding example the Veterans' Administration. Many veterans who have shed their blood and almost given their lives in defense of this country have compensation and pension claims against their Government. Can they go to the judiciary? No. They cannot go to the judiciary. They must go to the Veterans' Administration. The Congress passed the law. If they want to appeal, can they appeal to the Federal courts? No. They cannot appeal to the Federal courts. They appeal to special boards or commissions acting as courts that are set up by this Congress. It is a case absolutely on all fours.

If you want to follow the force of his logic, you can say that Congress was entirely wrong when we voted to oust certain people from the pay rolls of the Government. A man by the name of Dodd, another man by the name of Watson—I do not recall the name of the other man—were ousted from the pay roll. We passed an amendment to an appropriation bill here putting these three employees off the pay roll entirely because we did not like what they believed and advocated.

Now, if we are to follow entirely the logic of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] why do we not follow it completely and give these men a trial, an opportunity to be heard before the Federal judges, whom the distinguished gentleman from Illinois commented on so highly. There is a place where it is perfectly proper for the Congress to assume the jurisdiction it has assumed in the case of the Office of Price Administration, in the administration of veterans' matters, and other matters of that kind.

#### CAUTIOUS CONGRESS

This Congress, I think, is to be commended as well as the last Congress. Never before in the history of this country has Congress been so cautious about the granting of great powers, almost unlimited powers, to the Chief Executive of our Nation. And as you will recall, every major law that has granted powers to the Chief Executive, along with these tremendous powers you will find what we may call in the language

of the street, a cut-off period. For example, the law creating the Office of Price Administration will expire next year, June 30, 1944. It will be a good time to determine whether Congress wants price control or inflation right during the political campaigns. All of these laws, containing these vast powers, will expire at a fixed date.

The majority of these laws affecting the conduct of the war, containing the tremendous powers given to the Executive, contain a cut-off period under which the law will expire at the end of the war, within 6 months after the war is over, or upon the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States.

No Congress has been more watchful than this Congress and the preceding Congress on that question. We have made sure that the people's rights were protected and not granted to the Executive for an unlimited period of time.

I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in expressing the opinion that the three branches of the Government—each one should respect the other—and I think it is very necessary that comity exist between the different branches of the Government. We should have good feeling existing between the Congress and the judiciary; we should have good feeling between the Congress and the Executive. But I think also there is something we could do in that respect. We cannot always just jump on the efforts of the President—administration—and never be willing to point out a single constructive action taken or to make a single constructive suggestion; just condemn and expect to have a very fine feeling of comity, or to expect a good feeling to exist between these two branches of the Government. I feel that sometimes we are a little bit too critical, that many times we are too ready to find fault.

May I suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I think that this country is in favor of keeping down inflation, that it is opposed to higher prices, to the extent that wages and salaries are not able to bear; that it is opposed to paying \$1.25 for a loaf of bread, the price that exists in some of the countries of the world today; that it is opposed to people paying \$400 or \$500 for a suit of clothes like the ones you and I are wearing that would cost from \$25 to \$50 here; that it is opposed to people paying from \$60 to \$90 a pound for butter, as is being paid in some countries; that it is opposed to paying \$7.50 for a half pint of milk, as is happening in some countries.

Are we for inflation or are we against inflation? If we are against inflation we have got to place the tools that are needed to whip inflation in the hands of the Chief Executive. When we have placed those tools in the hands of the Chief Executive, I think we should assume the policy of cooperation and trying to get mistakes corrected, errors corrected, and where wrongs are committed, to get them corrected, rather than trying to make a body blow or attack as is now being made upon the O. P. A. law.

#### ARE REPUBLICANS FOR PRICE CONTROL OR INFLATION?

I think that the efforts made by the gentleman from Illinois to try to turn the O. P. A. law over to the Federal judges in this country would be one of the worst steps that we can take at any time with respect to the inflationary move that has been made in this Congress. To my knowledge it would mean unbridled inflation, it would result in printing press money and we will reach the time, if we adopt such a program, that it will take a wheelbarrow load of printing-press money to buy just one loaf of bread. We will be met with all the troubles of inflation. If prominent leaders of the Republican party like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] continue to advocate measures that will destroy price control efforts the party cannot long escape the charge that it is the inflationary, printing-press money party. Do the other Republican leaders agree with Mr. DIRKSEN that we should destroy price control and have runaway prices? They talk more about doing things to destroy O. P. A. than they do offering constructive suggestions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, October 7, I may address the House for 20 minutes after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAGNUSON for 7 days, on account of special naval business.

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of California) indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON) for today and balance of this week, on account of death in family.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that com-

mittee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes), the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the



U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private ship-  
 ping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of \$2,300,000 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

770. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

771. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

772. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

773. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the Division of Venereal Diseases of the Public Health Service, "Community Facilities, Defense Public Works, Office of the Administrator, Federal Works Agency (transfer to Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service)"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

774. A letter from the Senior Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting a copy of the Bureau of the Budget form entitled "Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements" and accompanying justification material which present the personnel requirements of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COSTELLO: Special Committee on Un-American Activities submits a minority report and views on Japanese War relocation centers; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3236. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3309. A bill to suspend

during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3338. A bill relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Mary T. Reedy; with amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; with amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3355. A bill to define the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct" as used in any law or regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3357. A bill to provide for the burial in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3358. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots in the Air Forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 3360. A bill to extend to members of the armed forces certain privileges with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3361. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to pro-

vide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 3362. A bill to fix the annual compensation of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3363. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," and to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 3367. A bill to provide for the national defense and to improve the flood control of the Red River by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties near Denison in the State of Texas and within the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3368. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Hearn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 3370. A bill for the relief of R. W. Crews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Knapstein Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2591. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin J. Ryan and 45 other persons, protesting

the current campaign of the prohibitionists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2592. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 55 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelbyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2593. Also, petition of 202 citizens of Kirkwood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2594. Also, petition of Lizzie M. Hutchinson and 39 citizens of Batavia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2595. Also, petition of Mrs. P. A. Tate and 63 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2596. Also, petition of Paul C. Hartzell and 48 citizens of Greenville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2597. Also, petition of Mary E. Bridson and 21 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2598. Also, petition of 72 citizens of Dunkirk, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2599. Also, petition of 33 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2600. Also, petition of Isabel Lovering and 95 citizens of Lansdale and Providence, R. I., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United

States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2601. Also, petition of 52 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2602. Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Shepard and 66 citizens of Frankfort, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2603. Also, petition of Mrs. Gordon Conrad and 50 citizens of Kenka Park, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2604. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ed Berger and 79 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2605. Also, petition of E. L. Mankel, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2606. Also, petition of Edward Wedel of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2607. Also, petition of Dominic Streff and 49 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2608. Also, petition of the Conrad Motor Sales Co., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2609. Also, petition of Henry Levison, of St. Louis, and 341 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2610. Also, petition of Ben Schnetzer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2611. Also, petition of Berlin Giles and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2612. Also, petition of John Rohrbach and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2613. Also, petition of Local No. 6, Brewers and Malters Union, signed by 80 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2614. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of sundry residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting



against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2615. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Morrison and Noah Oil Operators, of Albion, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 3203 providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2616. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Neva Piland and others of Foll and Ozark Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2617. Also, petition of T. W. Endicott and others of Hbcomo and Howell Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2618. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2619. Also, petition of Mrs. G. J. Ragain and others of Marionville and Lawrence Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2620. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Mrs. F. Brooks and others favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2621. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Leah Sterling, of Eagle Rock, Calif., and others, approving House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2622. Also, petition of Rev. E. Dow Hoffman and others, favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., relative to care of returning disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2624. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of J. A. Fisher and 21 other citizens of Weston and Buckhannon, W. Va., favoring enactment of House bill 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities

of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2625. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. G. T. Dickinson and 49 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. Also, petition signed by J. C. Gearhart and 25 other citizens of Willamina, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2627. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. T. M. Gladden and 65 members of the First Methodist Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2628. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Garden City, Kans., favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of H. J. Dickherber and 30 other citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2630. Also, petition of Morris Care, of Silex, Mo., and 43 other citizens of the ninth district, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2631. Also, petition of C. E. Schuchman, American Legion Post, No. 323, and 14 citizens of Wentzville, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2632. Also, petition of Joe H. Sachs, of Flinthill, Mo., and 28 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2633. Also, petition of Becker's Service Station, Flinthill, Mo., and 41 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2634. Also, petition of Theo. Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 23 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2635. Also, petition of Victor Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 69 other citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2636. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Thorp, College Place, and Outlook, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2637. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, committee on York, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Select Committee on Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

2638. Also, petition of the Cumberland United Baptist Association, Portland, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to liquor advertising in newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2639. Also, petition of the city of Waukegan, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Lake Michigan when it is at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, all things wax old as doth a garment; but Thou art the same. Thy years shall not fail. Change and decay in all around we see, but Thy mercy endureth forever.

Give us the untroubled calm which illumines a faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. May we see and know Thy word as the power of a growing seed hidden in the cleft of the rock, which presently it will split to pieces. In the light of Thy presence may we know that we live only as we love; that we are strong only as we are pure; that we succeed only as we are just and merciful and good. In this tumultuous day when the highways for Thy conquering truth are being paved even by the wrath of man, we pray not that Thou shouldst help us carry out our plans, but that we may be the willing channels for Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### LAND IN UTAH TO BE RESERVED FOR ADDITION TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT, COMMISSION, ETC.

Letters from the Postmaster General, the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, and the Chairman and Administrator of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, the Office of Strategic Services, and the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.